



2026:AHC:14507

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 1547 of 2026

Kuldeep Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 9 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Arvind Kumar, Pramod Kumar Pandey, Shikha Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Azad Rai, C.S.C.

Court No. - 2

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. The petitioner has preferred present writ petition inter-alia with the following prayer :-

"I. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent no.3 to decide the Case No.1057 of 2024 (Computerized Case No. D202402030001057) 'Kuldeep Kumar Vs. Vinod Kumar and others', under section 30 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006; within a specific period as fixed by this Hon'ble Court"

2. It appears from perusal of the records that for the same relief earlier petitioner has approached this Court by filing a petition being Writ C No.12777 of 2024, which was disposed of on 27.04.2024 with the following directions :-

"Heard Sri Pramod Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri Satyendra Nath Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, who appears respondents no. 1 to 3. Sri Azad Rai, has accepted notice on behalf of respondent no.4.

In view of the order, which is being proposed to be passed today, notices are not being issued to the respondents no. 5 to 8.

The solitary relief sought in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondent no.3, Chief Revenue Officer, Prayagraj to decide the proceedings under Section 30 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 being Case No.1057 of 2024 (Computerized Case No.D202402030001057), Kuldeep Kumar vs. Vinod Kumar and others.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite the fact that the petitioner is the owner of the demise Gatas but now constructions have been raised by the private respondents.

Learned Standing Counsel has no objection to the relief.

Considering the submissions of the rival parties as well as stand taken by them, the writ petition is being disposed off requiring the third respondent, Chief Revenue Officer, Prayagraj/Competent Authority empowered under the statute to decide the proceedings within a period of four months from the date of production of the certified copy of the order subject to legal impediment if any after hearing the affected parties in accordance with law.

Needless to point out that the writ petition has been decided without seeking any response from the respondents. Thus, passing of this order may not be construed to an expression that this Court has gone into the merits of the case.

With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is disposed off."

3. From perusal of the aforesaid it is clear that this is second writ petition against the same relief, which is not permissible in law.

4. In view of the same, present writ petition is dismissed.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

January 20, 2026

Pramod Tripathi